



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

with the sense, and helps rather than hinders the reader. Only a few markings really disturb, as xv. 8.5: *Adsisimus apud vos—optimi rei publicae defensores,—causae*, etc. Perhaps parentheses would be better here, and throughout the text the comma might well be placed after rather than within the parenthesis.

The second volume, which the editor promises shortly, will contain elaborate indices, a discussion of the MSS and their interrelation, and a section on paleography. It will complete a truly monumental work. No American before has published an edition of the entire remains of an ancient author, based on a first-hand knowledge of all the MS evidence available and presenting this evidence in a commodious and final form.

E. K. RAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

*Die Ilias und Ihre Quellen.* Von DIETRICH MÜLDER. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. x+372 pp. M. 10.

Here is another book on Homer, a book of nearly four hundred pages of absolutely new and original matter. Indeed the author is so original that he does not quote a single modern scholar, except himself. The results of Homeric scholarship from Wolf to Fick are cast aside. *Kleine Lieder*, *Uriliad*, *Flickpoet*, *Bearbeiter*, and the *Aeolic Homer* are summarily dismissed and the reader is invited "sich frei zu machen von der ungeheuren Last der Tradition und vorläufig die wirklichen oder vermeintlichen Errungenschaften unserer Homerforschung mit mir prinzipiell und konsequent zu negieren" (p. 4).

The author seeks to establish the following eight theses:

1. The *Iliad* is a unity, composed according to a single plan.
2. The undoubted difficulties connected with the theory of unity are due to the material in which the poet worked.
3. The *Iliad* belongs, not at the beginning, but at the end of a period of rich literary development.
4. The literature of this period forms the sources (*Quellen*) of the *Iliad*.
5. These sources are not songs (*Lieder*) in the sense of Lachmann, nor indeed songs in any other sense.
6. These sources belong in but small part to the Trojan cycle.
7. A large part of the work of Homer consisted in connecting the non-Trojan with the Trojan cycle.
8. Such a task could not have been performed by chance, by organic development, nor by a compiler (*Bearbeiter*), but demanded the creative poet.

Mülder then undertakes to arrive at the sources of the *Iliad* by a careful study of the *Iliad* itself:

Homer set for himself the task of creating an epic on a universal basis, an epic in which all the Greek world should take a common part, in which all should have a share in the hearer's sympathies, hence the conception of a foreign war.

The sources for his knowledge and for the traditions of that early age were poems dealing with single tribes or divisions of the Greeks. The Theban-Argive epic which told of an attack on a walled city furnished the conception and the basis for the attack on Troy; a poem dealing with Thessalian raids on the shores of Asia Minor gave the conception of an oversea expedition and furnished the details for the forays of the *Iliad*; an expedition for plunder could not make the necessary appeal to the sense of justice, so another poem dealing with the rape of a beautiful woman supplied the moral pretext for the war; this motive was too slight to call on the services of such remote chieftains as Achilles and Odysseus, so its cogency is only vaguely assumed. A Rhodian-Lycian epic told of Tlepolemus, the Rhodians, Sarpedon, Glaucus, and the Lycians; a Pylian-Epeian epic told of Nestor and the funeral games held in honor of Amarynkeus, the pattern for the games in honor of Patroclus; the story of Niobe and the loss of her children furnished the hint for the description of Priam in the tent of Achilles; the epic concerning Heracles furnished the background for the anger of Hera, since the anger of Hera has no pretext in A, also for the deception of Zeus, and the part taken by the god Sleep; Meleager and his anger, as told in I, is the model for the anger of Achilles.

Whatever the traditions or fate of Troy may have been, it is the genius of Homer and not history that brought Nestor, Ajax, Diomedes, and most of the other heroes before its walls. The material of these epics furnished the poet no basis for his grand conception of the universal idea.

Homer's relation to his sources is well shown in the Meleager parallel, a parallel given I, 529 ff.:

In the story of Meleager anger and abandonment of the battle occupy the same position as in the "wrath" of Achilles; in each the first phase is joined to defeat, the second to victory. In adversity the countrymen of Meleager send supplications to him in vain. The anger, the entreaties, the refusal are the same in each. Which is the original? The unusual anger of each presupposes some extraordinary cause. In the case of Meleager the cause is sufficient; the cursing of a son by his own mother because of his success in battle is something so terrible and unusual that it must rouse the anger of the son and force his withdrawal from battle, while the anger of Achilles is less rational and out of all proportion to the assumed cause. When Meleager abandoned the battle he of necessity remained at the scene of action, in his own city and with his own wife, but when Achilles renounced the war there was no reasonable alternative except to return home, yet he remained, full of the desire for war, hoping that he would be recalled into battle. The poet felt the weakness of the motive for holding Achilles, so invented the "plan" of Zeus and the advice of Thetis. Even in the petitions and the petitioners the *Iliad* stands on a weaker footing than in the story of Meleager. Real friendship fails the ambassadors, the guilty mother is lacking, the place of the father Oineus is taken by the foster-father Phoenix, while Patroclus plays the part of the wife Cleopatra. The tears of Cleopatra move Meleager to immediate and personal action, while the weaker tears of Patroclus exert

a weaker force. Meleager yields entirely, Achilles but half; he will not go himself, yet sends Patroclus. In the *Iliad* there is but a single embassy to Achilles, yet in three parts; in the epic of Meleager there are three groups, first the official embassy of elders and priests, then the relatives, finally his youthful friends. In Homer the details are varied, but the idea of three is maintained. Odysseus represents the officials, Ajax the friends, and Phoenix the father. Phoenix then is simply a substitute for Oineus. As the foster-father of Achilles he should properly be in the tent with him, yet the force of the pattern was such that it is necessary he should come to Achilles to plead, a thing so unnatural that the poet does not attempt to explain it or give it a motive, but simply assumes it as a fact; however, when he has filled the rôle of a pleader, as substitute for Oineus, the force of the pattern fails and Phoenix remains with Achilles.

His relation with the Theban-Argive epic is as follows: Troy is another Thebes, but instead of the pretext for war as given in the Seven against Thebes Homer adopted and adapted the Rape of Helen. The united action of several Greek heroes against Thebes is the basis of the idea of a union of all the Greeks against Troy. It is the Argives before Thebes which suggested the Argives at Troy, and the leader of the Argives is the leader in each. Tydeus at Thebes reappears in his son Diomedes at Troy, while Adrastus reappears in the commander Agamemnon, king of Argos; and Hector is substituted for the defender of Thebes. Evidently the Theban epic was written from the side of the defenders, and when the champion goes to meet the invader he knows the combat is to be decisive, so bids a bitter farewell to wife and family. This exactly suits the conditions of the Parting of Hector and Andromache, and it is because the defender of Thebes reappears in Hector that Homer paints him not as a barbarian but as a Greek. In this part of the poem Trojan names and Trojan customs hardly appear; here we find such a thoroughly Greek divinity as Athena, a Greek priestess, Theano, and such Hellenic customs as a procession of women to the temple and the gift of an embroidered robe. In the present connection Andromache's pleading for the defensive is pointless, as well as her description of attacks and methods of defense; there was no attack on the walls of Troy, while the presence of warriors mounted on chariots, so necessary a part of the Theban story, seems out of place in an oversea war.

The charge made against Homer that he was unpatriotic, because he painted Hector in too sympathetic a manner, is to be explained as due to the material from which he created Hector, since he took a Greek hero from defending Thebes, renamed him and transferred him to Troy.

These two illustrations give a faint impression of the wealth of the book and show that in Mûlder's view Homer took small suggestions, connected them, and filled them with life, pathos, and poetry. The few lines in which the story of Meleager is told show how slight the pattern is in comparison with the finished whole. Mûlder says, p. 338,

The sources gave merely the simple, the objective, the direct, the actual from which the creator of the *Iliad* with rich fancy and consummate art created the complicated, the subjective, and the emotional. . . . [p. 342]. The poet of the *Iliad* must have a place among the most original and inventive of all lands and of all ages.

No one can doubt that Homer must have drawn on preceding tradition and literature for his knowledge of the age described, but just because we have no independent knowledge of this literature or tradition it is impossible to decide what is due to the source and what is due to Homer. Even when we do have the source it is difficult to judge which is the source and which the imitation; Mülder is certain that the speech of Priam in *Iliad* xxiv is modeled after a poem of Tyrtæus, while to most scholars the imitation seems just the reverse. Here we do have the original and the copy, yet cannot agree; but when one attempts to reconstruct an assumed original with no clue except that furnished by the copy there is no check on the most rash hypotheses. Where I have the material from which to form a judgment I cannot accept Mülder's theories in regard to original and copy, as in the assumed imitation of Tyrtæus by Homer and the assumption that the anger of Poseidon in the *Odyssey* is copied from the anger of Achilles in the *Iliad*.

While the arguments in regard to the sources are built upon too small a basis, the book is still one of unusual merit and every page is full of the most original and brilliant observations.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

---

*Aristotle on the Art of Poetry.* By INGRAM BYWATER. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909. Pp. xlvii + 387. 16s. net.

The peculiar value of the book lies in the wealth of illustration by which Professor Bywater endeavors to make Aristotle explain himself. A very striking use is also made of Isocrates. Add to this the scientific spirit, the fine sobriety, and textual acumen of Professor Bywater, and we have an edition which was much needed and which pretty well exhausts what antiquity can do to explain its own remains. It is a noble edition of the *Poetics* and in its way complete. But whether this famous book can be explained without venturing into a field from which Professor Bywater expressly excludes himself is another question.

It is no doubt true that Aristotle "would be surprised to find how large a meaning we are able to read into some of his more incidental utterances." But if the appeal is to Aristotle *redivivus*, would he not be still more surprised at the enormous energy expended upon determining his *ipsissima verba*? Would he not find the scholarship more congenial which argued with him upon first principles?

Of course what Aristotle really did mean is what we want to know, whether or not we like it or him for saying it, and everything depends upon how the metaphor of *κάθαρσις* originally suggested itself to him. All may agree that his first intention was a criticism of Plato. Does he not indeed consciously take up the mocking challenge which Plato makes to the champions of tragedy? Reducing to its simplest dimensions